



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,313	10/13/2003	Zachary J. Mason	SPARC.096A	3315
20995	7590	12/22/2006		
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			EXAMINER	
2040 MAIN STREET			GORTAYO, DANGELINO N	
FOURTEENTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE, CA 92614			2168	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/22/2006	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/684,313	MASON, ZACHARY J.	
	Examiner Dangelino N. Gortayo	Art Unit 2168	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dangelino N. Gortayo. (3) David Jankowsky (43691).  
 (2) Debbie Le. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 12 December 2006.

Type: a)  Telephonic b)  Video Conference  
 c)  Personal [copy given to: 1)  applicant 2)  applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)  Yes e)  No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ford et al. (US Patent 6,963,867 B2), Ortega et al. (US Patent 6,606,619 B2),  
Herz (US Patent 6,460,036 B1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f)  was reached. g)  was not reached. h)  N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
 DEBBIE LE  
 PRINCIPAL EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed the invention of claim 11 as it pertains to the prior art, wherein the limitation of dividing said total amount of credit by the number of ancestor nodes of the selected item to determine an amount of credit per ancestor to be distributed for the selection event was discussed. The cited section of Ford was discussed, as it pertains to the claims. While the category score is calculated in Ford, the applicant maintains that the claims teach the score is added to an individual item based on selection event. No agreement was reached, and the decision to wait for a formal written response to the arguments was reached. Additionally, the restrictability of claims 11-14 were discussed, as these claims are a distinct and separate invention from claims 1-10 and 15-16. No decision was made as to a restriction/élection, and an agreement was made to wait for a formal written response from the office. As per claim 1, the applicant's representative discussed the general invention of the claim, and more specifically discussed the limitation of evaluating differences between the individual user history scores and the collective user history scores to generate a relative preference profile for the user. Additional parts of the reference were brought up to support the Office's position, specifically column 70 lines 6-9, column 74 lines 48-51, and column 19 lines 49-55, wherein the user's interest may change over time and be plgrouped in a virtual community of users with common interests. No agreement was reached, and the decision to wait for a formal written response to the arguments was reached..